

[REDACTED]

From: Luke Barker <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, 31 January 2023 4:40 PM
To: IPCN Submissions Mailbox
Cc: IPCN Enquiries Mailbox
Subject: Continued Objection - Daracon's Martins Creek Quarry - SSD-6612
Attachments: Martins Creek Quarry objection - further information requested

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

To the Independent Commissioners and whomever Else it May Concern,

Please be advised that I, Luke Barker of [REDACTED] Paterson NSW 2421, hereby continue to object to Daracon's Martin Creek Quarry (SSD-6612) and their resubmitted Proposed Project Amendments as detailed in the DPE Response to IPC Questions dated 23.12.2022.

My previous objection that was sent on 15.11.2022 is also attached for easy reference.

The 11th hour Proposed Project Amendments have not given myself, business owners, organisational leaders or community members very much time to review and form a thorough opinion, However, it is fortunate that the proposed amendments are not significantly different to the original proposal that was being assessed. By that I mean, it still fails to address and mitigate the main concerns of myself and the majority of the wider community. It was farcical for the IPC to even consider the original proposal due to the many reasons already raised, and Daracon could obviously see this, but the proposed changes to the original submission are just as ludicrous. Daracon's terminology attempts to hoodwink you into thinking they are doing everyone a favour by 'reducing' the trucking rates. However, it is still a very significant increase to the current approvals. Daracon's submission still fails to take into account the many other vehicular movements (trucks, utes, cars, etc) that would be required to service the Quarry (ie supplementary supplies, consultants, assessors, management, cleaners, maintenance, etc). I would like to think that the IPC commissioners can see through the bullsh*t being fed up. I would not normally use profanity in a submission of this importance, but it is again left up to the community to prove the dishonesty of their corporate spin...and we are all tired...but still very angry that this is still up for any sort of consideration.

Daracon continue to reference the point that the Quarry has been operating for over 100 years. I am at a loss as to why this is relevant. At that point in time, Paterson was serviced by Rail, Ferry and Horse & Cart. Tobacco was great, the fantastic asbestos product was on the way and life expectancy was about 50 years of age. To say times have changed would be an understatement. And to think that traditionas should continue due to longevity is perverse. The proposed haulage route uses roadways designed originally for the horse and cart not 32 tonne truck & dogs. The noise pollution, diesel particulate and other airborne dust pollutants (in particular silica particles causing silicosis) have now been magnified by the size, scope and speed of operations. The health issues surrounding this quarry are of grave concern and we hope that the IPC are aware of this. My 3 children certainly are and they will be the most affected by this into the future.

Daracon continues to dismiss out of hand the lived experience of the residents and belligerently conflate years and timelines to give the false impression that all was rosy except for those few years where they blatantly broke the law and disregarded the governing oversight. Nothing to see here good commissioners! Just because Railcorp exceeded the conditions of Quarry operations before Daracon took ownership does not give it rights to do the same thing. Railcorp saw the error in their ways, saw that it was no longer viable and thus sought to dispose of it. Daracon just happened to

be the chump that bought it. This has now proved to be quite an error in judgement by the Management Team of Daracon and instead of admitting to a bad investment, they choose to fight everyone and anyone to say otherwise.

And, to be still clear, I have yet to be consulted about the original proposal, this amended proposal or have had any other direct contact from Daracon in any form. I live on the Haul route, on the Quarry side of the Paterson township and my house is 20m from the Haul road. Anyone want to chat??

My children continue to board the school bus on the opposite side of the road to our house and this significant increase in truck movements only serves to put them and any other road user in direct harm. The area is also becoming more popular with cyclists which compliments the region's award winning Mountain Bike Park in Dungog. The region is now continue to swell with more subdivisions and the additional traffic that inevitably comes with them. "Codes of Conduct", "Reminders to drivers" and "increasing vigilance" hardly provides me with any comfort that we won't just end up having to continually monitor and call to complain at our own expense and at our considerable time.

On page 37 of the response, Daracon quote that *"It is estimated that only 5-10% of annual production will be delivered locally"*, and *"It is not intended that the quarry would service a substantial amount of local projects"*. To me this seems to contradict Daracon's response to point 1 in that the Quarry is essential to meeting local regional demand. If not being used locally in the region, then you could only surmise that the quarry would be only servicing markets outside of the region. If this is the case, then again, why can't it be moved predominantly by Rail? Who benefits with this quarry if they not supplying the local regional demand? Just the Mingay family... at the expense of every other family in the region that is affected by the quarry.

In short, Daracon does not welcome the plain fact that the asset they bought is not a viable quarry to the extent to which they wish to use it. Daracon further needs to come to terms with the fact that they don't always have to 'win'. Railcorp disposed of the asset for a reason. Daracon thought they could flout the conditions imposed upon the quarry and the rules it was to be governed by. The locals, the Councils affected by them and the impacted general interest groups called them out on it and won in Court.

Currently Daracon (through its subsidiary/associates) own 2 neighbouring properties in the main street of Pateron. These were both designated for supposed off street parking. One of these is now currently for sale (20 King Street - <https://www.realestate.com.au/property-residential+land-nsw-paterson-203507648>). This indicates to me that Daracon are no longer interested in being part of the community. The other property is still held by the Susan Mingay Family Trust (which is a substantial ultimate beneficiary of the Quarry operations). I remain sceptical of the parking proposal and believe that this neighbouring property will also be sold due to the complexities of making it a usable car park facility (due to flooding issues, off street access and the site's considerable slope down toward the river making car access unservicable).



Thanks for taking the time to review this submission and we welcome the IPC choosing **not** to recommend the proposed development.

Regards,

Luke Barker

Luke Barker
Chief Financial Officer



The information contained in this email message and any attachments is confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, interference with, disclosure or copying of this material is unauthorised and prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please immediately advise the sender by return email and delete the message from your system.

